UNITED STATES DISTRICT COUR	RT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YOR	
	x
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	JUDGMENT INCLUDING SENTENCE
-A-	UNDER THE SENTENCING REFORM ACT
RAFAEL RODRIGUEZ	CASE NUMBER: CR-03-1368 (ARR)
	118-35 QUEENS BOULEVARD
	FOREST HILLS, NEW YORK 11375
	Defendant's Attorney & Address
THE DEFENDANT:	
	nts three & four and five of the superseding indictment a
plea of not guilty.	and in an amount of the second manual (a)
following offenses:	ant is ADJUDGED guilty of such count(s), which involve the
_	ATURE & OFFENSE COUNT NUMBER(S)
21 USC 952(a), 963,	ATURE & OFFENSE COUNT NUMBER(S) ONSPIRACY TO IMPORT THREE (3)
960 (a) (1) & T	ESS THAN 50 KILOGRAMS OF MARIJUANA.
960 (b) (4)	200 IIII 00 KIDORED OF REKIDORIA.
	ONSPIRACY TO DISTRIBUTE & FOUR (4)
	OSSESS WITH INTENT TO DISTRIBUTE LESS THAN 50 KILOGRAMS
	F MARIJUANA.
	provided in pages 2 through of this Judgment.
	ant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984.
	found not guilty on count(s) and is discharged as
to such count(s).	
	smissed on the motion of the United States.
XXX It is ordered that th	e defendant shall pay to the United States a special
assessment of \$200.00 wh	nich shall be due XXX immediately as follows:
The Santhan Oppopp that the	
It is further ORDERED that the	defendant shall notify the United States Attorney for this
district within 30 days of an	y change of residence or mailing address until all fines,
restitution, costs, and speci	al assessments imposed by this Judgment are fully paid.
Defendant's Soc. Sec #	APRIL 13, 2006
Defendant's Soc. Sec #	Date of Imposition of Sentence
Defendant's Date of Birth 7/2	
Determine 5 Date of Differ 172	<u> </u>
Defendant's Mailing Address:	ALLYNE R. ROSS, U.S.D.J.
	0
185 OAK STREET, 1ST FL.	APRIL 13, 2006
	Date
WEST HEMPSTEAD, NEW YORK 1155	2
	A TRUE COPY ATTES
Defendant's Residence Addres	s: Date:
	ROBERT C. HEINEMANN
( SAME AS ABOVE )	CLERK OF COURT

DEPUTY CLERK

Defendant: RAFAEL RODRIGUEZ Case Number: CR-03-1368 (ARR)

Judgment - Page

of

## IMPRISONMENT

The defendant is hereby committed to the custody of the United States Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of six (6) months. The sentences on both counts of the superseding indictment are to run concurrently.

The defendant is remanded to the custody of the United States The defendant shall surrender to the United States Marshal district,  ata.m./p.m. on as notified by the Marshal.  The defendant shall surrender for service of sentence at t designated by the Bureau of Prisons  XXX before 12:00 noon on 5/23/06 as notified by the United States	for this  he institution
as notified by the Marshal.  The defendant shall surrender for service of sentence at t designated by the Bureau of Prisons  XXX before 12:00 noon on 5/23/06	he institution
as notified by the Marshal.  The defendant shall surrender for service of sentence at t designated by the Bureau of Prisons  XXX before 12:00 noon on 5/23/06	he institution
designated by the Bureau of Prisons  XXX before 12:00 noon on 5/23/06	·
	tes Marshal.
RETURN	
I have executed this Judgment as follows:	
ndant delivered on to	
, with a certified copy of this	Judgment.
	1 - 1
no	as notified by the Probation  RETURN  I have executed this Judgment as follows:

Defendant: RAFAEL RODRIGUEZ Case Number: CR-03-1368 (ARR)

Judgment - Page

of

## SUPERVISED RELEASE

Upon release from imprisonment, the defendant shall be on supervised release for a term of two (2) years.

While on supervised release, the defendant shall not commit another Federal, state, or local crime and shall comply with the standard conditions that have been adopted by this court (set forth on the following page). If this judgment imposes a restitution obligation, it shall be a condition of supervised release that the defendant pay any such restitution that remains unpaid at the commencement of the term of supervised release. The defendant shall comply with the following additional conditions:

- 1) DEFT SHALL NOT POSSESS ANY FIREARMS.
- 2) DEFT SHALL PARTICIPATE IN SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT WITH A TREATMENT PROVIDER SELECTED BY THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT. TREATMENT MAY INCLUDE OUTPATIENT OR RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT AS DETERMINED BY THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT. DEFT SHALL ABSTAIN FROM ALL ILLEGAL SUBSTANCES AND/OR ALCOHOL. DEFT SHALL CONTRIBUTE TO THE COST OF SERVICES RENDERED VIA CO-PAYMENT OR FULL PAYMENT IN AN AMOUNT TO BE DETERMINED BY THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT, BASED UPON THE DEFT'S ABILITY TO PAY AND/OR THE AVAILABILITY OF THIRD PARTY PAYMENT.
- \_\_\_\_ The defendant shall pay any fines that remain unpaid at the commencement of the term of supervised release.

Defendant: RAFAEL RODRIGUEZ Case Number: CR-03-1368 (ARR)

Judgment - Page of

## STANDARD CONDITIONS OF SUPERVISION

While the defendant is on probation or supervised release pursuant to this Judgment:

- 1) The defendant shall not commit another Federal, state or local crime;
- 2) the defendant shall not leave the judicial district without the permission of the court or probation officer;
- 3) the defendant shall report to the probation officer as directed by the court or probation officer and shall submit a truthful and complete written report within the first five days of each month;
- 4) the defendant shall answer truthfully all inquiries by the probation officer and follow the instructions of the probation officer;
- 5) the defendant shall support his or her dependents and meet other family responsibilities;
- 6) the defendant shall work regularly at a lawful occupation unless excused by the probation officer for schooling, training, or other acceptable reasons;
- 7) the defendant shall notify the probation officer within seventy-two hours of any change in residence or employment;
- the defendant shall refrain from excessive use of alcohol and shall not purchase, possess, use, distribute, or administer any narcotic or other controlled substance, or any paraphernalia related to such substances, except as prescribed by a physician;
- 9) the defendant shall not frequent places where controlled substances are illegally sold, used, distributed, or administered;
- 10) the defendant shall not associate with any persons engaged in criminal activity, and shall not associate with any person convicted of a felony unless granted permission to do so by the probation officer;
- 11) the defendant shall permit a probation officer to visit him or her at any time at home or elsewhere and shall permit confiscation of any contraband observed in plain view by the probation officer;
- 12) the defendant shall notify the probation officer within seventy-two hours of being arrested or questioned by a law enforcement officer;
- 13) the defendant shall not enter into any agreement to act as an informer or a special agent of a law enforcement agency without the permission of the court;
- 14) as directed by the probation officer, the defendant shall notify third parties of risks that may be occasioned by the defendant's criminal record or personal history or characteristics, and shall permit the probation officer to make such notifications and to confirm the defendant's compliance with such notification requirement.

These conditions are in addition to any other conditions imposed by this Judgment.

	ndant: RAFAEL RODRIGUEZ Number:CR-03-1368(ARR)			Judgment -	· Page	0
	FINE WITH S	SPECIAL ASSES	SMENT			
of a	The defendant shall pay to the Unit fine of \$ N/A and a speci	ted States th Lal assessmen	ne sum of \$ <u>2</u> t of \$ <u>200.0</u>	00.00 ,	consisti	ng
	These amounts are the totals of the counts, as follows:	ne fines and	assessments	imposed on	individu	al
	This sum shall be paid im	mediately as follows:				
<u>XXX</u> pay a	The Court has determined that the any fines, cost of confinement or su	defendant do pervision.	es not have	the ability	to	
	The interest requir	cement is wai	ved.	lows ·		

uoc 1.0	o ci otogo / ittit	0-1/20100 1 age 0 01 11 1 age 10 11. 1021			
		1			
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK				
2	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	x			
3	Plaintiff,				
4		03 CR 1368			
5		ited States Courthouse 5 Cadman Plaza East			
6	Br	ooklyn, N.Y. 11201			
7	RAFAEL RODRIGUEZ,				
	DEFENDANT.				
8		х			
9		April 13, 2006			
10		10:30 a.m.			
11	TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCE Before: HON. ALLYNE R. ROSS,				
12		DISTRICT COURT JUDGE			
12	APPE	ARANCES			
13	ROSLYNN R. MAUSKOPF				
14	United States Attorney - Eastern District of New York One Pierrepont Plaza				
15	Brooklyn, New York 11201				
16	STEVEN D'ALESSANDRO, ES	Q.			
17	Assistant United States Attorn	ey			
18	ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT:				
19	CHRIS RENFROE, ESQ.				
20	SABRINA SHROFF, ESQ.				
21	Court Reporter: ALLAN R. SHEF				
22	Brooklyn, New	aza East Rm 374 7 York 11201 50-2529 Fax: (718) 254-7237			
23	Tel: (/16) 26				
24					
25	Proceedings recorded by mechan	nical stenography, transcription			

THE COURT: Addressing first the guidelines, the parties agree that defendant's participation in an 80-pound marijuana importation conspiracy calls for a base offense level of 18. The parties sharply dispute their assessment of defendant's role, however. Notwithstanding the government's contentions to the contrary, the probation department persists in its view consistent with that of defendant that defendant is entitled to a four level deduction for minimal role.

The government contests any role deduction, urging rather that an aggravating two level enhancement for role is appropriate.

I concur with the defendant and the probation department. Indeed, I view defendant's role in this conspiracy as so evanescent and, dramatically limited that even a four level deduction does not suffice to reflect proper mitigation of the seriousness of the offense.

The evidence of his participation in this conspiracy derives primarily from a single tape recording of a conversation between Lall and Rodriguez on September 29, 2003, introduced at trial as Government's Exhibit 5 E and several other recordings that place it in context.

The evidence established that Lall arranged with a Jamaican marijuana supplier to import a shipment of marijuana on an American Airlines flight from Jamaica and recruited Gullston, a supervisor of the American Airlines warehouse

where the cargo shipment was to be stored either to "pull" the shipment or perhaps to transport the shipment from the warehouse to a Lall associate, or possibly to provide Lall or his associate access to the pallet at the warehouse.

Lall, following a conversation with his supplier, immediately called Gullston and insured his availability to provide the unspecified assistance on the ground when the shipment arrived on October 6, 2003. 2 days later, on September 29, 2003, Lall called Rodriguez, recorded as tape 5E about an entirely separate marijuana scheme, telling Rodriguez that he, Lall, had secured a shipment of 800 pounds of marijuana, leading to a discussion between the two concerning that shipment.

It was only after they had discussed Lall's news that Rodriguez changed the subject, telling Lall that he had "bumped into [Gullston] at a gas station" and during that conversation, Gullston had assured Rodriguez that "whenever you, [Lall], are ready, just let him [Gullston] know and he will give me, [Rodriguez], whatever I want over there".

Initially Lall is perplexed about who and what Rodriguez is referring to, asking Rodriguez: "What are you talking about?" Rodriguez then clarifies that he is referring to Gullston "Anthony from the midnight club," and tells Lall that Gullston related to him that Gullston and Lall had already spoken.

Rodriguez adds: "Now we, [Gullston and Rodriguez] got together. It's all good, dude."

Although there is no evidence of a marijuana shipment on October 6, 2003, the evidence established a seizure of 35 kilograms of marijuana on October 13 following its arrival at JFK on an American Airlines flight originating in Jamaica. After the seizure Gullston arrived at work and left a message for Lall, asking what was going on. Gullston had also tried to contact Rodriguez who had not returned Gulston's call.

In protesting any role reduction for Rodriguez, the government advances the argument that it is reasonable to infer from the evidence that Rodriguez should be accorded a role enhancement as he recruited Gulston and managed his activities.

The government's argument is understandable as it comports with an observation I made in my post-trial opinion rejecting defendant's Rule 29 motion. Upon reflection, however, and closer review of the record, I am persuaded that I was mistaken in observing that this is a permissible inference from the evidence. The only reasonable inference to draw is that Rodriguez at most wanted to confirm for Lall that Gulston would make himself available.

This is evident from a number of facts. First, Lall had already himself directly recruited Gulston before

Rodriguez spoke with him. Second, defendant's conversation with Gulston confirming the latter's readiness actually occurred coincidently. The two spoke because they had bumped into each other at the gas station. Indeed, when Rodriguez first told Lall about his conversation with Gulston, Lall initially had no understanding of who or what Rodriguez was talking about.

Notably, too, Rodriguez told Lall that in his conversation with Gulston, Gulston explained that he, Gulston and Lall, had already discussed the matter.

In view of this record, the most that can be said is that while Rodriguez was apparently eager to assist Lall in some unspecified way, Lall and Gulston had already reached an arrangement.

In another argument, the government interprets a statement by Rodriguez as suggesting that Gulston was subordinate to Rodriguez by reading the pronoun "you" in the phrase attributed to Gulston, whenever "you're ready" to refer to Rodriguez rather than Lall.

In my view, the more reasonable interpretation of the reference is that Gulston told Rodriguez that whenever Lall was ready, Gulston would assist.

Thus, I find nothing in the record to suggest that Rodriguez enlisted Gulston's assistance or supervised or managed his activities in any way.

Defense counsel is correct that insofar as Rodriguez does seem eager to confirm Gulston's assistance to Lall, he seems merely to be interjecting himself where his help would never have been sought. Clearly, tape 5E demonstrates that Rodriguez has some knowledge of the importation and distribution conspiracy and is desirous of playing a role but the meager affirmative steps he takes, as reflected in tape 5E, were apparently neither necessary nor even solicited.

There is no evidence to support the inference that Rodriguez enlisted Gulston or, beyond his palpable desire to help and the fact that he reconfirmed Gulston's assistance, had any identifiable role in the scheme. The only other evidence -- that when Gulston arrived at work on October 13, 2003, he tried unsuccessfully to contact both Lall and Rodriguez -- does tend to suggest that Rodriguez was likely aware that the shipment was to arrive on that date but it does not serve to delineate what role Rodriguez was to serve at that time.

Although one might infer that Rodriguez was somehow to be involved in moving the shipment, even that inference is tenuous since Gulston had already told Lall that he, Gulston, would "pull" it.

In short, although the evidence does suffice to establish defendant's knowing and intentional participation in the conspiracy, the only evidence of his actual role

establishes that his function is redundant as counsel has noted. That does not, of course, absolve Rodriguez of guilt but it does warrant according him a minimal role in the conspiracy.

Accordingly, I find that Rodriguez's adjusted offense level under the advisory guideline is 14, which with a criminal history category of one carries a range of imprisonment of 15 to 21 months. In assessing an appropriate sentence, I have considered the advisory guidelines.

Turning to the nature and circumstance of defendant's offense, I have already addressed at length the evidence establishing that defendant's role was uniquely limited. Though the evidence established Rodriguez to be a culpable coconspirator, his only role reasonably inferable from the trial evidence, that is insuring that Gulston was available, was participation that does not appear to have been solicited and was in fact redundant.

I have rarely encountered a case in which defendant's role was so marginal and peripheral and I believe my exposure reasonably comparable to that of judges nationwide. Therefore, I believe this factor strongly mitigates defendant's culpability and the nature and seriousness his offense.

On the other hand, in considering the nature and circumstances of the offense, I have in the case of

Mr. Rodriguez, like the other airport employees, considered as an exacerbating factor the fact that he made use of his job position at JFK Airport in the committing the crimes of which he was convicted.

Although I have found that the government failed to present evidence sufficient to find by a preponderance that law enforcement authorities in fact reposed trust in the airport employees, a finding essential to impose the abuse of trust enhancement under the advisory guidelines, there is ample evidence in the record to establish the defendant took advantage of his job in committing these offenses, a job that though not established to be a repository of trust by law enforcement, is nonetheless a highly sensitive one due to the enhanced societal dangers posed by corruption at a major international port or airport such as John F. Kennedy International Airport.

That said, however, weighing the nature and circumstance of defendant's offense, I find that on the whole, they sharply limit the seriousness of his conduct. I reach this conclusion primarily based on the bizarrely restricted role he played in the crime coupled with absence of evidence of weapons or violence of any kind.

Turning to the history and characteristics of the defendant, Mr. Rodriguez is a 38 year old citizen. He is married and he and his wife together have a 15 year old son.

Additionally, defendant's wife has four children from a prior marriage whom defendant sponsored to come to the United States, legally adopted them and enabled them to acquire United States citizenship.

Of these, at least four, and presumably their three progeny, remain financially dependent upon defendant, his wife who is unemployed and who experiences health problems, their 15 year old son, his stepdaughter Aneya who is unemployed and has two children, and his stepdaughter Lorena, a college student and the mother of one child.

Defendant has had a consistent work history even following his arrest. He managed to secure work for some period of time as a delivery driver. Again, following his release from five weeks imprisonment after his conviction in the middle of last year, he returned to the same job he had previously held with Walsh Messenger Service. And I gather now he was free-lancing but essentially doing the same thing. While employed, defendant also engaged in various educational programs, completing two semesters at a technical institute, a real estate course and a computer graphics course.

Defense submissions also document that the defendant's wife has suffered a number of health problems and powerfully demonstrate the extent to which all of the children are fiercely supportive of their father. Of particular significance is the fact that in July of last year, defendant

voluntarily entered a substance abuse program to deal with his marijuana addiction. This factor, voluntary presentence rehabilitation, also militates in favor of leniency in sentencing.

Notably, two defendants had no prior convictions or arrests or any prior brushes the with the law.

Given all of the facts and circumstances pertaining to the defendant and his offenses, I believe that a sentence of six months imprisonment is sufficient but not unduly severe to accomplish the goals of sentencing enumerated in Section 3553(a).

Though the crimes of conviction are serious, their seriousness is mitigated in the defendant's case, rendering the selected sentence sufficient to promote respect for the law and serve the goals of just punishment.

Further, in my estimation, the facts and circumstances of this case point to an extremely low risk of recidivism, suggesting that the selected sentence amply serves the statutory goal of protection of the public against future acts of the defendant.

Finally, in light of all of the circumstances discussed, I view the selected sentence as sufficient to serve the goals of general deterrence and to insure that the sentence imposed not create unwarranted sentencing disparities.

I believe this sentence under the circumstances of defendant's case is of sufficient severity to serve as a deterrent to other airport employees who might otherwise succumb to the temptation to corrupt their sensitive positions for pecuniary or other personal gain.

I therefore sentence Mr. Rodriguez to the custody of the Attorney General for six months, to be followed by a two-year period of supervised release with special conditions that he participate in any substance abuse treatment with a treatment provider selected by the probation department.

Treatment may include outpatient or residential treatment. The defendant shall abstain from all illegal substances and/or alcohol and contribute to the cost of services rendered by co-patient or full payment in an amount to be determined by the probation department based on his ability to pay and/or the availability of third-party payment. I also prohibit possession of a firearm.

I make a finding that he is unable to pay a fine but I will impose the mandatory \$200 special assessment and I should clarify that the 6 months custody is to run concurrently on counts three and four.

There are underlying indictments?

MR. D'ALESSANDRO: There are underlying indictments. We move they be dismissed.

THE COURT: The motion is granted.

	1
1	Mr. Rodriguez, as you know, you are entitled to
2	appeal both your conviction and your sentence. If you choose
3	to appeal, a notice of appeal must be filed within 10 days. I
4	know that you have retained counsel. If for some reason you
5	could not afford counsel on appeal, counsel would be appointed
6	to represent you.
7	I'm assuming because there is so little time left on
8	Mr. Rodriguez's sentence, that he is automatically going to go
9	to the MDC but if you have any other request, I'll honor it.
10	MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, may he surrender at an
11	appropriate date?
12	THE COURT: Yes.
13	MS. SHROFF: Does the Court have a date in mind?
14	THE CLERK: May 24th.
15	MS. SHROFF: Thank you, your Honor.
16	(Matter concluded.)
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
L.	